DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 724 TM 860 739

AUTHOR Shafer, Robert E.
TITLE State Competency Testing for Teachers: Problems with Testing Grammar,
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Grammar; Higher Education; *Language Tests; Language Usage; *Licensing Examinations (Professions); Secondary School Teachers; State Programs; State Standards; *Teacher Certification; Test Bias; *Testing Problems; Testing Programs; Test Items; *Test Validity; Writing Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Arizona; *Arizona Teacher Proficiency Examination

ABSTRACT

In Arizona, beginning teachers applying for certification must take the Arizona Teacher Proficiency Examination which tests professional knowledge, reading, mathematics, and grammar. The high failure rate on the grammar test has caused a great deal of concern; 40 percent of the examinees, and a higher percentage of minority groups, failed it in 1984. Interviews with examinees who had taken the grammar test indicated they recalled questions which concerned writing conventions, grammatical structure, writing, and editing. Major concerns about test validity were expressed by an experienced journalist who felt that the concepts tested were controversial. In addition, the accepted definition of grammar varies from expert to expert, as does the value of teaching traditional grammar for writing instruction. A number of opinions defining appropriate English usage, grammatical etiquette, or standard classroom English are held by the public, educators, state legislators, and test developers. It is recommended that these persons understand that the English language, and therefore the definition of appropriate grammar, is constantly changing. (GDC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277724

State Competency Testing for Teachers: Problems With Testing Grammar, Usage, and Writing

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Shafer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Robert E. Shafer
Arizona State University
American Educational
Research Assocation
San Francisco, California
April 16-20, 1986

TM 860 739

The case for teacher certification is built upon three fundamental assumptions. First, that the state has the right and obligation to determine whether an individual is competent to practice a profession where it is clear that unless the state engages in regulation, incompetent practice in an occupation may lead to harm or injury to the client. This certification of competency needs to be done before the individual is allowed to begin practicing. Teaching is one of these occupations since it involves imparting knowledge, the development of skills and the inculcation of attitudes and values. One should not be allowed to practice as a teacher unless the appropriate knowledge, skills, and values can be demonstrated in practice by any person proposing to become a teacher. In addition, the act of teaching itself has an influence on students apart from the accuracy of information that is presented by the teacher. Uninformed teaching procedures may bring physical and psychological harm to students. A basic idea behind certification is that the person being certified is "safe to practice," through demonstration of appropriate knowledge, teaching competencies and professional values before he or she is sent out to teach in the schools.

A second assumption concerning teaching certification is that teaching is a complex process which requires a period of education and training with multiple opportunities for assessment of teaching competencies. As the practice of teacher certification has grown up in the various states, certification

laws have stipulated the completion of certain educational and training experiences which are necessary to ensure that teacher candidates have prepared themselves appropriately for the competencies they will be expected to demonstrate and the tasks they will be expected to perform in classrooms.

Third, the certainty of the first two assumptions is now substantiated by a large body of research on teacher effectiveness. This research clearly shows that individuals who have gone through a certification program, where there are multiple opportunities for the assessment of the complexities of teaching, are more effective teachers than those who have not gone through such a program. This body of research is persuasive, not because of its depth or the precision of research methodology, but because over time it has consistently refined its definitions of teaching effectiveness so that they are susceptible to evaluation. A recent summary of this research has been done by Greenberg (1983) which covers the period from the early 1960's to the late 1970's.

This is not to say that testing and evaluation at various points in a teacher education program cannot serve a useful purpose. There seems to be a growing movement across the country to test both pre-service and in-service teachers in various ways. This demand undoubtedly stems from the publics' apparent dissatisfaction with today's teachers, especially with the quality of incoming teacher candidates. This unhappiness on the part of the public manifests itself in some measure as dissatisfaction with teacher education programs in the nation's colleges of education. Gregory R. Anrig (1986) points out that

thirty-eight states now require teachers to test for certification with some currently considering legislation for recertification or advanced certification under current career ladder/merit pay plans (p. 448). Anrig (1983) sounds the following cautionary note about the use of tests in screening prospective teachers:

> Most standardized tests that I know of cannot accurately measure such qualities as dedication, motivation, perseverance, caring, sensitivity, or integrity. Yet, when we remember outstanding teachers from our own school days, those are among the qualities that made them excellent. We must admit the limits of tests and the restrictive range of qualities that they can measure. Moreover, we should recognize that tests can present and measure only a sample of the knowledge required for teaching . . . All of this suggests that policy makers should keep teacher tests in their proper prospective as in other fields of professional licensure and certification, tests in education are important aids for insuring that new entrants have mastered the basic knowledge relevant to the job. They can also be useful to candidates as ways to identify strengths and weaknesses in their preparation (p. 448).

Proposals for the testing of both pre-service and in-service teachers continue to be made by state legislatures. Two years ago in both Arkansas and Texas bills were passed which required currently employed teachers -- regardless of years of services and ratings by school supervisors -- to be tested for recertification in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. Such a testing program is unprecedented for any other occupation requiring state licensure or certification.

Currently in Arizona all college graduates applying for teacher cerftification must take the Arizona Teacher Proficiency Examination which has both a section on professional knowledge and also has sections on reading, mathematics, and grammar. The

sections on reading, mathematics, and grammar are now required of college students who complete teacher preparation programs in the state's teacher preparing institutions. Although copies of the examination are not available for inspection or scholarly study, ten interviews have been held with university English majors who have recently taken the examination. Also, press reports concerning the examination were examined for the purpose of preparing this report.

A major issue causing concern among the public in Arizona including members of the state legislature, The Arizona Board of Regents and among various teacher organizations concerns the high failure rate among persons taking the grammar section of the examination. During the fall of 1984, 40% of persons failed the grammar section of the examination. According to a recent article in the Arizona Republic, from August 1984, through January 1985, (Arizona Republic, January 27, 1985, pg. A15):

> . . . the grammar portion was failed by nearly 55% of the Hispanics, nearly 70% of the Indians and 59% of the Blacks. Anglo students fared better but still 36% failed the grammar portion of the exam.

According to the Republic's story, (pg. A16), "The high failure rate in the grammar portion has prompted education officials to consider lowering the passing standard of that portion, despite a legislative mandate last year to strengthen the exam." In Arizona we have a current dispute between the legislature and the Board of Regents over using the total test as a screen for students entering teacher education programs. Legislation that went into effect in 1985 required that the basic skills portion of the test (grammar, reading, and mathematics) be given to

students seeking certification as teachers in Arizona. That legislation further stipulates that college graduates seeking certification in Arizona, must pass each portion of the basics skills test with at least an 80% score. Before August 3rd 1985, students could pass the test if they scored a composite grade of 80%. If students, for example, did well in math but poorly in grammar, they might still pass the test. The State Department of Education is under continuing pressure by minority groups to revise the test. Indeed it has been reviewed by at least two committees already. The twelve member technical panel which recently reviewed the test was made up of university and community college faculty, including researchers who specialize in psychometry,found that "potential bias against minorities exists in asking test takers to:

a. Determine whether exclaimation points are used properly.
b. Identify correct verb tenses in sentences.
c. Identify words that sound the same but are spelled differently.
d. Distinguish between fact and opinion in a reading passage. (Arizona Republic, January 27, 1985, pg. A15).

An Arizona Republic reporter, one Jacquee G. Patchel, who took the test as an experiment wrote in an accompanying story on January 27 as follows:

> The grammar test figures show, why it is particularly difficult for minorities. I don't wonder why. I, a 26 year old Anglo woman, passed the grammar component of the exam with an 82%, just one question short of flunking. (This, despite the fact that I, too, am a graduate of Arizona State University and have five years experience in journalism.) That's right, journalism. You know, a profession requiring a mastery of grammar, sentence structure, and the written word. .

> Educators studying the tests' potential bias point to my score as a case in point for concern about the tests' validity. If an Anglo woman with a college degree and five years experience in jounralism missed nine grammar questions, what's happening to minority college students or new graduates who take the test? More than half of them are failing.
>
> I certainly am no expert in psychometry -- the study of testing or racial discrimination in testing. I also don't pretend to be an academic wizard.
>
> I do know this, I was quizzed on the test about proper use of hyphens. We don't even agree in this newsroom about the use of hyphens . . . (Arizona Republic, 1985, pg. A16).

Ten graduating seniors from Arizona State University applying for teaching certificates in English from the state of Arizona were interviewed shortly after they took the Arizona Teacher Proficiency Examination. Eight of the ten remembered test items that dealt with the following conventions of writing in the grammar section of the test:

a. Whether the comma came inside or outside the quotation marks.
b. The use of hyphens.
c. The proper use of exclamation points.
d. Using commas in a series.
e. Using commas before introductory items, e.g. Thursday, I went to the station; or, Thursday (no comma) I went to the station.
f. Punctuation of abbreviations and dates.

Seven of the ten interviewed remembered test items which could clearly be called grammatical and which had to do with the following concepts:

a. Subject/verb agreement.
b. Selection of the correct form of a regular verb.
c. Selection of the correct form of an irregular noun.
d. Agreement of an indefinite pronoun with a verb.
e. Split infinitives.
f. Identification of sentence subjects.
g. Identification of sentence predicates.

Eight of the ten remembered being asked to answer items in the

following category which have to do with spelling, revising and editing written texts.

a. Identify words that sound the same but are spelled differently.
b. Identify correct verb tenses in sentences.
c. Identify the proper order of sentences in a paragraph.
d. Identify where a paragraph break should be in a written text.

Although all the items in the first section remembered by the college students are clearly conventions of writing and those in the second section concern grammatical structure, and those in the third writing and editing all are lumped under the section "Grammar" in the test and all apparently constituted "grammar" seems to be the rule rather than the exception in test making. Ney (1977) has commented on the problem after studying a revision of the ACT Test.

> In any case . . . under the sections on diction, organization, style, and logic, Aristotle himself would have difficulty. Who knows exactly when one paragraph ends and another begins? Hopefully, test writers can chose places which are clear and unambiguous, but on this item, I fudged, accepting the test specialists' markings as confirmation of my own guess. The same could be said about the other handbook specialities, such as the singleness of purpose of a paragraph, or consistency of point of view. Who's to tell? The item writer? The test specialist? The author of the handbook? . . . in any case sections on style and on the logic of written prose are extremely slippery for the test writer writing the test and the test writer taking the test. Who is to say that one set of words is in better style than another set of words? Who is to say whether the paragraph break is more logical here or there? Who can predict with certainty that a given set of sentences is in logical order? Does such a focus on such imprecisely defined <u>rights</u> and <u>wrongs</u> discriminate against the really good student and over-inflate the scores of those who are good with Ouija Boards? The answer may never be known but the possibility exists (p. 11).

A basic problem concerns test validity. If one is testing something called grammar, one should have a rather clear idea of

what one is testing for. The word "grammar" is susceptible, however, to varied meanings and interpretations in American English. W. Nelson Francis (1954) proposed that there were "three meanings of grammar" -- a matter which seems worth mentioning at this point. Francis' definitions are well known in the linguistic community, perhaps not so well known among test makers and the general public. They are as follows:

> The first thing we mean by 'grammar' is the set of formal patterns in which the words of a language are arranged in order to convey larger meanings.' It is not necessary that we be able to discuss these patterns self- consciously in order to be able to use them. In fact, all speakers of a language above the age of five or six know how to use its complex forms of organization with considerable skill; in this sense of the word -- call it 'Grammar one' -- they are thoroughly familiar with its grammar.
>
> The second meaning of `grammar' -- call it 'Grammar two' -- is 'the branch of linguistic science which is concerned with the description, analysis, and formulization of formal language patterns.' Just as gravity was in full operation before Newton's apple fell, so grammar in the first sense was in full operation before anyone formulated the first rule that began the history of grammar as a study. The third sense in which people used the word 'grammar' is 'linguistic etiquette.' This we may call 'grammar three.' The word in this sense is often coupled with a derogatory adjective: We may say the expression 'He ain't here,' is bad grammar.'. . .
>
> As has already been suggested, much confusion arises from mixing these meanings. One hears a good deal of criticism of teachers of English couched in such terms as "They don't teach grammar anymore." Criticism of this sort is based on the wholly unproven assumption that teaching grammar two will improve the student's proficiency in grammar one or improve his manners in grammar three. Actually, the form of Grammar two which is usually taught is a very inaccurate and misleading analysis of the facts of Grammar one; and it is therefore of highly questionable value in improving a person's ability to handle the structual patterns of his language. (pp. 300-301)

To paraphrase Francis -- a risky business at best since his prose is clear -- grammar one refers to the linguistic competence

that we carry around in our heads -- otherwise known as unconscious or implicit knowledge of our language which all of us use everyday to carry on our communicative needs. Grammar two is what linguists and grammarians are concerned with, a "description, analysis and formulization of formal language patterns." These mostly have been done in grammar textbooks in several major categories. First of all, there is traditional grammar -- the kind of grammar that Bishop Lowth and Lindley Murray developed from Latin in eighteenth century England which, still exists in varying forms in many American school textbooks. This is where we have obtained such completely false insights about English such as that it contains "eight parts of speech." A second category is structural grammar derived from Leonard Bloomfield's 1933 grammatical analysis of the English language perpetuated by such persons as Charles Fries, in his books American English Grammar, and Structure of English published in the 1950's. A third category of Grammar two is the category oftransformational grammar derived from Noam Chomsky's book Syntactic Structures (1957), and his other writings. A few ill-fated attempts were made to teach transformational grammar and structural grammar in the schools in the 1950's and 1960's. Most of these attempts have now fallen by the wayside but since the onset of such movements as "back to basics," and "accountability" in education, we have seen many members of the public, school board members, state legislators and even some teachers who are pressing for a return of traditional grammar which they are certain will bring about the basic literacy that they are

concerned our population has lost.

The first problem underlying the testing of grammatical knowledge of either prospective students or of teachers, concerns the basic assumptions that 1) if people know either traditional structural or transformational grammar -- but most particularly traditional, they will be able to write and speak fluently, and 2) if teachers know and teach structural, transformational, or traditional, but most particularly traditional grammar they will be able to therefore bring about fluency in reading and writing in their students. This issue concering attitudes about the efficacy of teaching and testing grammar, may be one of the most complicated we have in education. Many of society's leaders, indeed those who are among our most fluent writers and speakers, often feel strongly that their fluency in reading and writing is due entirely to the fact that their high school English teacher imbued them with the features of traditional grammar. Since they feel so strongly that this is what made them fluent and therefore successful in society, they logically enough, want the same treatment for their children. Most do not believe the conclusions of educational research, particularly when such research has been recently called in to question. Many in the English teaching community have long believed that the the issue of the relationship between teaching grammar and the development of fluency in writing was settled more than twenty years ago with the conclusions offered by Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones and Lowell Schoer (1963) in their well known survey of the research in written composition:

> In view of the widespread agreement of research

> studies based upon many types of students and teachers, the conclusion can be stated in strong and unqualified terms: The teaching of former grammar has a neglibigle or, because it usually displaces some instruction and practice in composition, even a harmful effect on improvement in writing. (pp. 37-38)

Recently, however, this conclusion has been called into question by other reviewers. Neulieb (1977) was tempted "to sputter on paper" at reading the Braddock, Lloyd-Jones and Schoer "alchemists" for their reading of the research results. Neulieb (1977) reviewed five experimental studies, most of them concluding that formal grammar instruction has no effect on the quality of student's writing nor on their ability to avoid errors. In a sense she does not view the matter as closed by these studies and calls for more research on the issue. Kolln (1981), reviewed six similar studies that arrived at the same conclusion, only one of them overlapping with the studies reviewed by Neulieb. She called for a more careful definition of the word "grammar" also indicates that she does not accept the findings of these research studies. She concludes with a clarion call to place grammar instruction at the center of composition curriculum: "Our goals should be to help students to understand the system they know consciously as native speakers, to teach them the necessary categories and labels that will enable them to think about and talk about their language." (p. 150) Both Kolln and Neulieb conclude their reviews of research in the teaching of grammar by indicating that the current crisis in literacy is most surely a result of the lack of mastery of formal grammar. Both call for a new emphasis on the teaching of formal grammar which they propose is basic for the development of fluency in writing.

Therefore the issue of whether teaching traditional grammar is effective or ineffective is once again joined -- despite the research about the value of teaching traditional grammar which has been going on for more than 75 years. In a recent issue of College English, Patrick Hartwell (1985) again reviews this 75 years of research and comes to the following conclusion:

> . . . but 75 years of experimental research has for all practical purposes told us nothing. The two sides are unable to agree on how to interpret such research. Studies are interpreted in terms of one's prior assumptions about the value in teaching grammar: Their results seem not to change those assumptions. Thus, the basis of their discussion, a basis shared by Kolln and Neuleib, by Braddock and hiscolleagues -- 'What does educational research tell us' -- seems designed to perpetuate, not to resolve, the issue . . . It would seem unlikely, therefore, that further experimental research, in and of itself, will resolve the grammar issue. Any experimental design can be nit picked, any experimental population can be criticized, and any experimental conclusion can be questioned, or, more often, ignored. In fact, it may well be that the grammar question is not open to resolution by experimental research . . . (pp. 106-110)

Although Hartwell (1985) pointed out the problem of persons in the English teaching profession supposedly trained in some extent in the methods of science and the implications of the tradition of scholarly and scientific research to accept the findings of such research, he nevertheless attempts to convince his readers by using examples of other writers on the subject as follows:

> I try to consider a hostile reader, one committed to the teaching of grammar, and I tried to think of ways to hammer in the central point of this distinction, that the rules of Grammar two are simply unconnected to productive control over Grammar one (going back to Francis' earlier distinctions). I can argue from authority: Noam Chomsky has touched on this point whenever he has concerned himself with the implications of linguistics for language teaching, and

> years ago transformationlist Mark Lester stated unequivocally , 'There simply appears to be no correlation between a writer's study of language and his ability to write.' I can cite analogies offered by others: For instance Christiansen's analogy in an essay originally published in 1962 that formal grammar study would be to 'invite a centipede to attend to the sequence of his legs in motion?' Or James Britton's analogy, offered informally after a conference presentation, the grammar study would be like forcing starving people to master the use of a knife and fork before allowing them to eat. I can offer analogies of my own, of contemplating the wisdom of asking a pool player to master the phusics of momentum before taking up acue or making a prospective driver get a degree in automotive engineering before engaging a clutch. I consider a hypothetical argument, that if Grammar two knowledge affected Grammar one performance, then linguists would be our best writers. (I can certify that they are, on the whole, not.) Such a position , after all, is only in accord with other domains of science: The formula for catching a fly ball in baseball ('Playing it by Ear," Scientific American, 248, No. 4, 1983, 76), is of such complexity that it is beyond my understanding -- and, I would suspect, of many work a day center fielders . . . p. 115

Notwithstanding the careful selection of the experts by Hartwell, and the care used by them in selecting their analogies most persons who believe in the teaching of traditional formal grammar as a way of contributing to writing fluency, apparently will not be convinced by analogies nor will they be convinced by the findings of research.

It is possible to hypothesize that it is Nelson Francis' Grammar three which may well be at the heart of the problem. Remember, that he called it "linguistic etiquette." He defined it further by saying "the word in this sense is often coupled with a derogatory adjective: We say that the expression 'He ain't here,' is bad grammar. . . " Perhaps it is actually Grammar three -- this "linguistic etiquette" in the sense of language usage that has pervasively affected the test makers in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the Arizona Teacher Proficiency Examination and in other similar examinations which have been developed in various states across the country and are now being used to screen teacher candidates.

There is another major problem with the testing of Grammar three (thinking it is Grammar two). As Williams (1981) has pointed out there is a whole spectrum of reaction to "offenses" involving usage. Williams attempts to categorize these reactions to usage "errors" in his article. He notes that some persons seem to overreact to certain errors which others have little reaction to at all.

> I am often puzzled by what we call errors in grammar and usage, errors such as different than, between you and I, a which for that, and so on. I am puzzled by what motive could underlie the unusual emotion a single error can elicit. In his second edition of On Writing Well, (New York, 1980), for example, William Zinsser, an otherwise amiable man I'm sure, uses, not disaprovingly, words like detestible vulgarity (p. 43), garbage (p. 44), atrocity, (p. 46), horrible, (p. 48); oaf (p. 42); idiot (p. 43); and simple illiteracy, (p. 46). To comment on usages like okay, hopefully, the affects-wise and myself in He invited Mary and myself to dinner. I am puzzled why some errors should incite this seeming fury while others, not obviously different in kind, seem to excite only moderate disapproval. And I am puzzled why some of us can regard any particular item as a more or less serious error, while others, equally perceptive, and acknowledging that the same item may in some sense be an 'error,' seem to invest in their observation no emotion at all. (p. 152)

The number of usage items which are apparently in the Arizona Teacher Proficiency Examination indicates that there is still very much concern about the matter of standard English usage as a status symbol and that we still look to the schools to supply a particular standard. Also, we call such activities, "teaching grammar." Indeed, these are precisely the activities Nelson Francis described as Grammar three. As J.J. Lamberts puts it:

> By tradition our schools have been committed to something called 'good English,' which if we get right down to it, is merely classroom English which includes no expressions that might trigger a frown of disapproval from an English teacher. Such English, however, serves only to show who 'belongs' in that particular situation. Ultimately one becomes identified with an occupation or some clearly defined activity and he adopts the language appropriate to it . . . It is assumed that elementary school teachers speak correct English: Is it perhaps that elementary school teachers have been trained to adopt a characteristic style of speaking, especially when they are speaking English, and it is this style that the public has come to regard as unusally correct? (p. 24)

Lamberts' book is part of the study of language usage in American English which began in the 1920's with researches by such scholars as Sterling A. Leonard into the history of the "doctrine of correctness" in American English with the assistance of Robert C. Pooley who accumulated incontestible evidence that present day "rules" in many school textbooks in use in today's schools had often been set down arbitrarily by the eighteenth century grammarians, Lowth and Murray. Lamberts has further pointed out:

> As the study of usage continued, the 'standards' which had appeared to be so substantial and so obvious during the 1920's grew gradually more and more elusive. The three level classification for explaining and especially for classifying varieties of usage continued to florish in the textbooks, complete with schematic diagrams, but improved far less productive than should be expected. Although the intermediate level was mentioned again and again under a variety of names, no one seemed able to identify any expressions that were characteristics of it. Finally, in the late 1940's, John S. Kenyon explained why. There was no such level in place of the three usage levels of the 1920's, Kenyon proposed two 'cultural levels,' as he called them: standard and non-standard. Other differences depended not on the social standing of the usage of English, but on the specific use to which the language is being put at a particular time.
>
> . . . what all this means is that we cannot take for granted a single overall correctness, as appealing as the idea may be, but that there are just as many

'correctnesses' as there are status-relevant situations. How 'correct' one is depends partly on his choice and partly on his linguistic sensitivity. In one situation he makes no effort whatever to join in; in another he seeks overtly to conform. The characteristic style of 'Black' speech of which White people have become increasingly aware in recent years is a striking example of a 'correct' variety of English within the larger speech community. (pp. 21-23)

It is this concept of "classroom English" or the Grammar three of Nelson Francis and the "doctrine of correctness" which it represents which is continuing to affect the attitudes of the American public about teaching and testing language or "grammar" and through the American public continue to affect the attitudes of board members, members of boards of regents, and state legislators and test makers as well. They seem to want a "classroom English" to be taught and passed on to school children and to them the term "grammar" represents this classroom English. The problem is, what precisely is this classroom English? "What is standard English?" In their 1979 study of Attitudes, Language and Change, Ann Ruggles Gere and Eugene Smith present summaries of attitudes towards language explaining that "the nature of linguistic attitudes and the processes whereby they may be changed are concerned with the myths which reside deeply and comfortably in our minds." (p. 8) In paired statements, the authors give examples of contrasting myths or assumptions of "standard English." Here is one pair:

> Myth 3A: 'Standard English' is a clearly definable set of correct pronunciations, grammatical structures and word choices. It is 'standard' because it represents the widest usage and because it has been refined to be the most versatile and acceptable form of English.
>
> Myth 3B: 'Standard English' in its spoken form is whatever variety of English is currently associated with prestige in a given community. There is much more

> variation in the acceptable and prestigious spoken forms within 'standard' than members of any one community might acknowledge. 'Standard English' in its written form, however, has a much narrower range of acceptable and prestigious choices. (p. 9)

It would seem that members of the public and their representatives in state legislatures and state departments of education are employing test makers, all of whom believe in Myth 3A, while most of the linguistic research we have had in the twentieth century indicates that Myth 3A is simply no longer true to the extent that this can be said to be so and that the truth is much closer to Myth 3B. At another point in their book, Gere and Smith try to develop a series of eight statements which underlie what they consider to be an 'enlightened' approach to language. The first of these statements is as follows:

> 1) The English language changes continually, and if it should cease to change it will no longer be a sufficient medium for human communication.

This concept of change in language change is a seminal concept of modern linguistics, yet it is a concept which is not understood by most persons who serve on school boards, serve as state legislators, and those persons who make up state and national tests in grammar. The thrust of Gere and Smith's book is that English teachers should put on a public relations campaign to change the attitudes of such people about language. Although they called for this in 1979, unfortunately it has not been in evidence in many places even though our knowledge of language learning and the nature of language is progressing through an explosion of knowledge. This knowledge about language and the ways it is acquired remains mostly in linguistic journals. Until

the concept of "appropriateness" as a standard in American English and the fact of continuing language change become as acceptable to the majority of Americans as nuclear fission and until the myths of language permanence and what Janet Emig (1980) calls the "magical thinking" no longer continue to prevail in teaching (magical thinking being the assumption that students will learn only what we teach and only because we teach it), we will undoubtedly continue to have difficulty with test making in the area of grammar.

REFERENCES

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones and Lowell Schoer. Research in Written Composition. National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Emig, Janet. "Non-Magical Thinking: Presenting Writing Developmentally in Schools," in "Writing Process Development and Communication," Vol. 2 of Writing: The Nature, Development in Teaching Written Communication, editors, Charles H. Frederiksen and Joseph F. Dominic (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1980, pp. 21-30.

Francis, Nelson. "Revolution in Grammar, Quarterly Journal of Speech, No. 49, 1954, pp. 300-301.

Gere, Ann Ruggles and Smith, Eugene. Attitudes, Language and Change, National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, 1979.

Greenberg, J.D. "The Case for Teacher Education: Open and Shut," Journal of Teacher Education (4) 1983, p. 2-5.

Hartwell, Patrick. "Grammar, Grammars and the teaching of Grammar," College English, Vol. 47, No. 2, February 1985.

Kolln, Martha. "Closing the Books on Alchemy," College Composition and Communication, Vol. 32, 1981, pp. 139-151.

Lamberts, J.J. A Short Introduction to English Usage. McGraw-Hill Book Company, NY, 1972.

Neulieb, Janice. "The Relation of Formal Grammar to Composition," College Composition and Communication. Vol. 23, 1977, pp. 247-250.

Ney, James W. "I Passed My ACT Test," English Journal, Vol. 66, No. 9, Dec., 1977, pp. 10-12.

Williams, Joseph M. "The Phenomenology of Error," College Composition and Communication, Vol XXXII, May, 1981, pp. 152-168.